	Case 2:23-cv-00875-KJM-DMC Docume	ent 17 F	Filed 01/12/24	Page 1 of 2
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
10				
11	ADAM RANDOLPH POWELL,	No.	2:23-CV-0875-I	KJM-DMC-P
12	Plaintiff,			
13	v.	FINE	DINGS AND RE	ECOMMENDATIONS
14	JEFF LYNCH, et al.,			
15	Defendants.			
16				
17	Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to			
18	42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's original complaint, ECF No. 1.			
19	On August 8, 2023, the Court issued an order addressing the sufficiency of			
20	Plaintiff's complaint. See ECF No. 11. The Court determined that Plaintiff's complaint states			
21	cognizable Eighth Amendment safety claims against Defendants Moirara and Lively arising from			
22	a January 22, 2022, incident at the California Medical Facility. See id. The Court also			
23	determined that Plaintiff's claims against the prison warden, Defendant Lynch, are insufficient.			
24	See id. Plaintiff was provided leave to amend and cautioned that, if no amended complaint was			
25	filed within the 30-day time period provided therefor, the action would proceed on Plaintiff's			
26	safety claims against Defendants Moirara and Lively and that the Court would recommend			
27	dismissal of Defendant Lynch. See id. As of November 2, 2023, Plaintiff had not filed an			
28	amended complaint and the Court directed service on Defendants Moirara and Lively consistent			
		1		

## with the August 8, 2023, order. See ECF No. 12. The Court now recommends dismissal of Defendant Lynch. Based on the foregoing, the undersigned recommends as follows: This action proceed on Plaintiff's complaint, ECF No. 1, as to Plaintiff's Eighth Amendment safety claim against Defendants Moirara and Lively. 2. Plaintiff's claims against Defendant Lynch be DISMISSED for failure to state a claim. These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within 14 days after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written objections with the Court. Responses to objections shall be filed within 14 days after service of objections. Failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal. See Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). Dated: January 11, 2024 DENNIS M. COTA UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Case 2:23-cv-00875-KJM-DMC Document 17 Filed 01/12/24 Page 2 of 2